arXiv:1609.01313v1 [math.GR] 5 Sep 2016

HIERARCHICAL HYPERBOLICITY OF ALL CUBICAL GROUPS

MARK F HAGEN AND TIM SUSSE

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex admitting a proper cocompact action by a group G. Then $\mathcal{X}$ has a *factor system* in the sense of [BHS14]. By results in [BHS14], it follows that G is a *hierarchically hyperbolic group*; this answers questions raised in [BHS14, BHS15]. Our results also resolve a conjecture of Behrstock-Hagen on boundaries of cube complexes.

Introduction

Considerable work in geometric group theory revolves around generalizations of Gromov hyperbolicity: relatively hyperbolic groups, weakly hyperbolic groups, acylindrically hyperbolic groups, coarse median spaces, semihyperbolicity, lacunary hyperbolicity, etc. In recent years much attention has been paid to groups acting properly and cocompactly on CAT(0) cube complexes, which are important examples of metric nonpositive curvature and which also have features reminiscent of hyperbolicity. Such complexes give a combinatorially and geometrically rich framework to build on, and many groups have been shown to admit such actions (for a small sample, see [Sag95, Wis04, OW11, BW12, HW15]).

Many results follow from studying the geometry of CAT(0) cube complexes, often using strong properties reminiscent of negative curvature. For instance, several authors have studied the structure of quasiflats and Euclidean sectors in cube complexes, with applications to rigidity properties of right-angled Artin group [Xie05, BKS08, Hua14]. These spaces have also been shown to be median [Che00] and to have only semi-simple isometries [Hag07]. Further, under reasonable assumptions, a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$ either splits as a nontrivial product or $\mathrm{Isom}(\mathcal{X})$ must contain a rank-one element [CS11].

Once a given group is known to act properly and cocompactly on a CAT(0) cube complex the geometry of the cube complex controls the geometry and algebra of the group. For instance, such a group is biautomatic and cannot have Khazdan's property (T) [NR98, NR97], and it must satisfy the Tits alternative [SW05]

Here, we examine the geometry of cube complexes admitting proper, cocompact group actions from the point of view of their convex subcomplexes, showing that such a complex has strong geometric restrictions. These translate into properties of the group via our main application:

Corollary A. *Let G act properly and cocompactly on the proper CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic space and G is a hierarchically hyperbolic group.*

Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces/groups (HHS/G's), introduced in [BHS14, BHS15]. HHS/G's were proposed as a common framework for studying mapping class groups and (certain) cubical groups. Knowledge that a group is hierarchically hyperbolic has strong consequences, detailed below, that imply many of the nice properties of mapping class groups. Our results place all cubical groups in this framework as well, immediately implying many of these properties, and filling in a major gap in the theory of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces.

Date: September 7, 2016.

Hagen was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council grant of Henry Wilton.
Susse was partially supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-1313559.

A main goal of [BHS14] was to develop a theory of the coarse geometry of CAT(0) cube complexes analogous to the Masur-Minsky theory for mapping class groups [MM99, MM00]. This goal was achieved in the context of cube complexes $\mathcal{X}$ with *factor systems*. A *factor system* $\mathfrak{S}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is a uniformly finite-multiplicity collection of convex subcomplexes that contains $\mathcal{X}$, contains each combinatorial hyperplane, and contains $\mathfrak{g}_F(F')$ whenever $F, F' \in \mathfrak{S}$, where $\mathfrak{g}_F : \mathcal{X} \to F$ is combinatorial closest-point projection. When they exist, factor systems provide the necessary analogue of the collection of all subsurfaces of a surface.

The reader will observe that it is the "uniformly finite-multiplicity" condition that can fail to hold: the simplest example is the staircase! Indeed, any 0–cube on the bottom step B is contained in a collection of subcomplexes of the form $\mathfrak{g}_B(R)$, where R is a horizontal combinatorial hyperplane, whose cardinality grows as one moves the point along B. Our main theorem rules this out for CAT(0) cube complexes with proper, cocompact group actions:

Theorem B. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex and let $G \leq Aut(\mathcal{X})$ act properly and cocompactly on $\mathcal{X}$. Then $\mathcal{X}$ contains a factor system.*

Theorem B and results of [BHS14] (see Remark 13.2 of that paper) together imply Corollary A, positively answering Question 8.12 of [BHS14] and part of Question A of [BHS15]. Previously, many CAT(0) cube complexes were known to have factor systems and thus be hierarchically hyperbolic, but it was not known that a geometric action guarantees a factor system.

One of the key technical insights of this paper is the following. First, in a CAT(0) cube complex, the *hyperclosure* $\mathfrak{F}$ is the set of convex subcomplexes one should consider when trying to find a factor system, namely the smallest set of subcomplexes that contains each combinatorial hyperplane and contains $\mathfrak{g}_F(F')$ whenever it contains F, F'. The hyperclosure $\mathfrak{F}$ is shown in Section 2 to have a graded structure: the lowest-grade elements are combinatorial hyperplanes, then we add projections of combinatorial hyperplanes to combinatorial hyperplanes, etc. This allows for several arguments to proceed by induction on the grade. Essentially by definition, a combinatorial hyperplane H is the *orthogonal complement* of a 1–cube e, i.e. a maximal convex subcomplex H for which $\mathcal{X}$ contains the product $e \times H$ as a subcomplex. We show, in Theorem 3.5, that, more generally, $\mathfrak{F}$ is precisely the set of convex subcomplexes F such that there exists a compact, convex subcomplex C so that the orthogonal complement of C is F.

Applications of Corollary A. Corollary A has numerous consequences for a group G acting geometrically on a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$. Denote by $\mathfrak{S}$ the factor system provided by Theorem B and recall from [BHS14] that each $F \in \mathfrak{S}$ is associated to a graph $\mathcal{C}F$ which is uniformly quasi-isometric to a simplicial tree (the *factored contact graph*). The import of Corollary A is that $\mathcal{X}$, equipped with this set of quasi-trees, and coarse projections $\pi_F : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{C}F$ explained in [BHS14], satisfies a list of axioms reminiscent of theorems about mapping class groups and curve graphs. Results about $G, \mathcal{X}$ which previously required one to hypothesize a factor system but which, in view of Corollary A, do not really need that hypothesis, include:

- In combination with [BHS14, Corollary 14.5], Corollary A shows that G acts acylindrically on the contact graph of $\mathcal{X}$, i.e. the intersection graph of the hyperplane carriers, which is a quasi-tree [Hag14].
- Corollary A combines with Theorem 9.1 of [BHS14] to provide a Masur-Minsky style distance estimate in G: up to quasi-isometry, the distance in $\mathcal{X}$ from x to gx, where $g \in G$, is given by summing the distances between the projections of x, gx to a collection of uniform quasi-trees associated to the elements of the factor system.
- Corollary A combines with Proposition 11.4 of [BHS14] to produce a G–equivariant quasi-isometric embedding of $\mathcal{X}$ into the product of finitely many quasi-trees, under a mild hypothesis on the group action.

- Corollary A combines with Corollary 9.24 of [DHS16] to prove that either G stabilizes a convex subcomplex of $\mathcal{X}$ splitting as the product of unbounded subcomplexes, or G contains an element acting loxodromically on the contact graph of $\mathcal{X}$. This is a new proof of the cocompact version of the Caprace-Sageev rank-rigidity theorem [CS11].

We now turn to applications of Theorem B that do not involve hierarchical hyperbolicity.

Applications of Theorem B to boundaries of $\mathcal{X}$. Theorem B also gives insight into the structure of the boundary of $\mathcal{X}$. To motivate these applications, we first mention an aggravating geometric/combinatorial question about cube complexes which is answered by our results.

A *staircase* is a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{Z}$ defined as follows. First, a *ray-strip* is a square complex of the form $S_n = [n, \infty) \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, with the product cell-structure where $[n, \infty)$ has 0–skeleton $\{m \in \mathbb{Z} : m \geq n\}$ and $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ is a 1–cube. To build $\mathcal{Z}$, choose an increasing sequence $(a_n)_n$ of integers, collect the ray-strips $S_{a_n} \cong [a_n, \infty) \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, and identify $[a_{n+1}, \infty) \times \{-\frac{1}{2}\} \subset S_{a_n+1}$ with $[a_n, \infty) \times \{\frac{1}{2}\} \subset S_{a_n}$ for each n. The model staircase is the cubical neighborhood of a Euclidean sector in the standard tiling of $\mathbb{E}^2$ by squares, with one bounding ray in the x–axis, but for certain $(a_n)_n$, $\mathcal{Z}$ may not contain a nontrivial Euclidean sector. From our combinatorial point of view, this makes no difference. (One can define a d-dimensional staircase by choosing $d-1$ sequences of integers $(a_n^{(1)})_n, \ldots, (a_n^{(d-1)})_n$ and considering the constructions above, gluing together steps of the form $[a_i^{(1)}, \infty) \times \cdots \times [a_i^{(d-1)}, \infty) \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$.) We will see below that the set of "horizontal" hyperplanes in $\mathcal{Z}$ – see Figure 1 for the meaning of "horizontal" – is interesting because there is no geodesic ray in $\mathcal{Z}$ crossing exactly the set of horizontal hyperplanes.



FIGURE 1. Part of a staircase.

Now let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex with a group G acting properly and cocompactly. Can there be a convex staircase subcomplex in $\mathcal{X}$? A positive answer seems very implausible, but, surprisingly, this question was open. Corollary C, a consequence of our main result, implies:

Corollary. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex admitting a proper cocompact group action. Then $\mathcal{X}$ does not contain a convex staircase.*

The more general version of this statement involves the boundary of $\mathcal{X}$. Specifically, the *simplicial boundary* $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$ of a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$ was defined in [Hag13]. The simplices of $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$ correspond to equivalence classes of infinite sets $\mathcal{H}$ of hyperplanes such that:

- if $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ are separated by a hyperplane V, then $V \in \mathcal{H}$;
- if $H_1, H_2, H_3 \in \mathcal{H}$ are disjoint, then one of H_1, H_2, H_3 separates the other two;
- for $H \in \mathcal{H}$, at most one halfspace associated to H contains infinitely many $V \in \mathcal{H}$.

These *boundary sets* are partially ordered by coarse inclusion (i.e., $A \preceq B$ if all but finitely many hyperplanes of A are contained in B), and two are equivalent if they have finite symmetric difference; $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$ is the simplicial realization of this partial order. The motivating example of a simplex of $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$ is: given a geodesic ray γ of $\mathcal{X}$, the set of hyperplanes crossing γ has the preceding properties. Not all simplices are realized by a geodesic ray in this way: a simplex in $\mathcal{X}$ is called *visible* if it is represented by the collection of hyperplanes crossing some combinatorial geodesic ray. For example, if $\mathcal{Z}$ is a staircase, then $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{Z}$ has an invisible 0–simplex, represented by the set of horizontal hyperplanes. However, using Theorem B, we resolve Conjecture 2.8 of [BH16], ruling out invisible simplices in the presence of geometric group actions:

Corollary C. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex which admits a proper and cocompact group action. Then every simplex is $\partial_\triangle\mathcal{X}$ is visible, that is, it is equivalent to the set of hyperplanes crossing an infinite geodesic ray. Moreover, let $v \in \partial_\triangle\mathcal{X}$ be a 0–simplex. Then there exists a CAT(0) geodesic ray γ such that the set of hyperplanes crossing γ represents v.*

The "moreover" part follows from the first part and [Hag13, Lemma 3.32]. Corollary C combines with [BH16, Theorem 5.13] to imply that $\partial_\triangle\mathcal{X}$ detects thickness of order 1 and quadratic divergence for G, without the visibility hypothesis imposed in [BH16]. Corollary C also implies the corollary about staircases at the beginning of this paper: if $\mathcal{Z}$ is a convex staircase in $\mathcal{X}$, then the "horizontal" hyperplanes represent an invisible 0–simplex of $\partial_\triangle\mathcal{X}$, a contradiction. More generally, we obtain the following from Corollary C and a simple argument in [Hag13]:

Corollary D. *Let γ be a CAT(0)-metric or combinatorial geodesic ray in $\mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is as in Corollary C and the set of hyperplanes crossing γ represents a d-dimensional simplex of $\partial_\triangle\mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a combinatorially isometrically embedded $d+1$-dimensional orthant subcomplex $\mathcal{O} \subseteq Hull(\gamma)$. Moreover, γ lies in a finite neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}$.*

(A k-dimensional orthant subcomplex is a CAT(0) cube complex isomorphic to the product of k copies of the standard tiling of $[0,\infty)$ by 1–cubes, and the convex hull $Hull(A)$ of a subspace $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is the smallest convex subcomplex containing A.)

Corollary D is related to Lemma 4.9 of [Hua14] and to statements in [Xie05, BKS08] about Euclidean sectors in cocompact CAT(0) cube complexes and arcs in the Tits boundary. In particular it shows that in any CAT(0) cube complex with a proper cocompact group action, nontrivial geodesic arcs on the Tits boundary can be extended to a arcs of length at least $\pi/2$.

Questions. Theorem B suggests questions. The first asks whether Theorem B is sharp:

Question 1. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a CAT(0) cube complex and let $G \leq \mathrm{Isom}(\mathcal{X})$.

- If $\mathcal{X}$ is locally finite and G acts cocompactly (not necessarily properly), must $\mathcal{X}$ contain a factor system?
- If $\mathcal{X}$ is uniformly locally finite and G acts essentially with no fixed point in $\mathcal{X} \cup \partial\mathcal{X}$, must $\mathcal{X}$ contain a factor system?

Modifying the hypotheses in these ways is reasonable since cocompactness is used in one isolated spot in the proof of Theorem B, namely Lemma 2.8. Positive answers to the above questions would allow one to carry out the HHS proof of the rank-rigidity theorem from [DHS16] at the level of generality of [CS11]. Finally, in [BHS15], it was suggested that Theorem B actually follows from a stronger statement. Specifically:

Question 2. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a CAT(0) cube complex which admits a proper and cocompact group action. Does $\mathcal{X}$ embed a convex subcomplex of the universal cover of the Salvetti complex of some right-angled Artin group?

We wonder whether the techniques of the present paper could be used to attack the above question, which is of considerable independent interest.

Plan of the paper. Section 1 contains background on CAT(0) cube complexes closely following [BHS14]. Section 2 studies the *hyperclosure*, a collection of convex subcomplexes, definable in any CAT(0) cube complex, which we will show has bounded multiplicity in order to prove Theorem B. In Section 3, we relate subcomplexes in the hyperclosure to the orthogonal complement operation on convex subcomplexes. Section 4 combines these ingredients into a proof of Theorem B, and in Section 5 we complete the proof of Corollary C and Corollary D.

Acknowledgements. MFH thanks: Jason Behrstock and Alessandro Sisto for discussions of factor systems during our work on [BHS14]; Nir Lazarovich and Dani Wise for discussions on Question 2, which remains open; Dan Guralnik, Alessandra Iozzi, Yulan Qing, and Michah Sageev for discussions about staircases. We thank Richard Webb and Henry Wilton for helping to organize the conference *Beyond Hyperbolicity* (Cambridge, June 2016), at which much of the work on this paper was done. Both of the authors thank Franklin for his sleepy vigilance.

1. Background

1.1. **Basics on CAT(0) cube complexes.** Recall that a *CAT(0) cube complex* $\mathcal{X}$ is a simply-connected cube complex in which the link of every vertex is a simplicial flag complex (see e.g. [BH99, Chapter II.5], [Sag14, Wis, Che00] for precise definitions and background). In this paper, $\mathcal{X}$ always denotes a CAT(0) cube complex. Our choices of language and notation for describing convexity, hyperplanes, gates, etc. follow the account given in [BHS14, Section 2].

Definition 1.1 (Hyperplane, carrier, combinatorial hyperplane)**.** A *midcube* in the unit cube $c = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$ is a subspace obtained by restricting exactly one coordinate to 0. A *hyperplane* in $\mathcal{X}$ is a connected subspace H with the property that, for all cubes c of $\mathcal{X}$, either $H \cap c = \emptyset$ or $H \cap c$ consists of a single midcube of c. The *carrier* $\mathcal{N}(H)$ of the hyperplane H is the union of all closed cubes c of $\mathcal{X}$ with $H \cap c \neq \emptyset$. The inclusion $H \to \mathcal{X}$ extends to a combinatorial embedding $H \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{N}(H) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}$ identifying $H \times \{0\}$ with H. Now, H is isomorphic to a CAT(0) cube complex whose cubes are the midcubes of the cubes in $\mathcal{N}(H)$. The subcomplexes $H^{\pm}$ of $\mathcal{N}(H)$ which are the images of $H \times \{\pm\frac{1}{2}\}$ under the above map are isomorphic as cube complexes to H, and are *combinatorial hyperplanes* in $\mathcal{X}$. Thus each hyperplane of $\mathcal{X}$ is associated to two combinatorial hyperplanes lying in $\mathcal{N}(H)$.

Remark. The distinction between hyperplanes (which are not subcomplexes) and combinatorial hyperplanes (which are) is important. Given $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, either a convex subcomplex or a hyperplane, and a hyperplane H, we sometimes say H *crosses* A to mean that $H \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Observe that the set of hyperplanes crossing a hyperplane H is precisely the set of hyperplanes crossing the associated combinatorial hyperplanes.

Definition 1.2 (Convex subcomplex)**.** A subcomplex $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is *convex* if $\mathcal{Y}$ is *full* — i.e. every cube c of $\mathcal{X}$ whose 0–skeleton lies in $\mathcal{Y}$ satisfies $c \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ — and $\mathcal{Y}^{(1)}$, endowed with the obvious path-metric, is metrically convex in $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}$.

There are various characterizations of cubical convexity. Cubical convexity coincides with CAT(0)–metric convexity *for subcomplexes* [Hag07], but not for arbitrary subspaces.

Definition 1.3 (Convex Hull)**.** Given a subspace $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, we denote by $Hull(A)$ its *convex hull*, i.e. the intersection of all convex subcomplexes containing A.

If $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a convex subcomplex, then $\mathcal{Y}$ is a CAT(0) cube complex whose hyperplanes have the form $H \cap \mathcal{Y}$, where H is a hyperplane of $\mathcal{X}$, and two hyperplanes $H \cap \mathcal{Y}, H' \cap \mathcal{Y}$ intersect if and only if H, H' intersect. Recall from [Che00] that the graph $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}$, endowed with the obvious path metric $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}$ in which edges have length 1, is a *median graph* (and in fact being a median graph characterizes 1–skeleta of CAT(0) cube complexes among graphs): given 0–cubes x, y, z, there exists a unique 0–cube $m = m(x, y, z)$, called the *median* of x, y, z, so that $Hull(x, y) \cap Hull(y, z) \cap Hull(x, z) = \{m\}$.

Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a convex subcomplex. Given a 0–cube $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there is a unique 0–cube y so that $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, y)$ is minimal among all 0–cubes in $\mathcal{Y}$. Indeed, if $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$, then the median m of x, y, y' lies in $\mathcal{Y}$, by convexity of $\mathcal{Y}$, but $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, y') = \mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, m) + \mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(m, y')$, and the same is true for y. Thus, if $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, y')$ and $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, y)$ realize the distance from x to $\mathcal{Y}^{(0)}$, we have $m = y = y'$.

Definition 1.4 (Gate map)**.** For a convex subcomplex $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, the *gate map* to $\mathcal{Y}$ is the map $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ so that:

(1) for all $v \in \mathcal{X}^{(0)}$, $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}}(v)$ is the unique 0–cube of $\mathcal{Y}$ lying closest to v;
(2) for any d–cube, labeled c, of $\mathcal{X}$ with vertices $x_0, \dots, x_{2^d} \in \mathcal{X}^{(0)}$, the map $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ collapses c to the unique k–cube c' in $\mathcal{Y}$ with 0–cells $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}}(x_0) \dots, \mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}}(x_{2^d})$ in the natural way, respecting the cubical structure.

The integer k in the definition above is the number of hyperplanes that intersect both c and $\mathcal{Y}$. The hyperplanes that intersect c' are precisely the hyperplanes which intersect both c and $\mathcal{Y}$. (Indeed, the Helly property ensures that there are cubes crossing exactly this set of hyperplanes, while convexity of $\mathcal{Y}$ shows that at least one such cube lies in $\mathcal{Y}$; the requirement that it contain $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}}(x_i)$ then uniquely determines c'.) Thus, for any convex subcomplex $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, the hyperplanes crossing $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}')$ are precisely the hyperplanes which cross both $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Y}'$. The next definition formalizes this relationship.

Definition 1.5 (Parallel)**.** The convex subcomplexes F and F' are *parallel*, written $F \parallel F'$, if for each hyperplane H of $\mathcal{X}$, we have $H \cap F \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $H \cap F' \neq \emptyset$. The subcomplex F is *parallel into* F' if F is parallel to a subcomplex of F', i.e. every hyperplane intersecting F intersects F'. We denote this by $F \hookrightarrow_{\parallel} F'$. Any two 0–cubes are parallel subcomplexes.

The following is proved in [BHS14, Section 2] and illustrated in Figure 2:

Lemma 1.6. *Let F, F' be parallel subcomplexes of the CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$. Then $Hull(F \cup F') \cong F \times A$, where A is the convex hull of a shortest combinatorial geodesic with endpoints on F and F'. The hyperplanes intersecting A are those separating F, F'. Moreover, if $D, E \subset \mathcal{X}$ are convex subcomplexes, then $\mathfrak{g}_E(D) \subset E$ is parallel to $\mathfrak{g}_D(E) \subset D$.*



FIGURE 2. Here, D, E are convex subcomplexes. The gates $\mathfrak{g}_D(E), \mathfrak{g}_E(D)$ are parallel, and are joined by a product region, shown as a cylinder. Each hyperplane crossing $Hull\big(\mathfrak{g}_D(E) \cup \mathfrak{g}_E(D)\big)$ either separates $\mathfrak{g}_D(E), \mathfrak{g}_E(D)$ (e.g. the hyperplane V) or crosses both of $\mathfrak{g}_D(E), \mathfrak{g}_E(D)$ (e.g. the hyperplane H).

The next Lemma will be useful in Section 2.

Lemma 1.7. *For convex subcomplexes C, D, E, we have $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{g}_C(D)}(E) \parallel \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathfrak{g}_D(E)) \parallel \mathfrak{g}_C(\mathfrak{g}_E(D))$.*

Proof. Let $F = \mathfrak{g}_C(D)$. Let H be a hyperplane so that $H \cap \mathfrak{g}_F(E) \neq \emptyset$. Then $H \cap E, H \cap F \neq \emptyset$ and thus $H \cap C, H \cap D \neq \emptyset$, by the comment following Definition 1.4. Thus $\mathfrak{g}_F(E)$ is parallel into $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathfrak{g}_D(E))$ and $\mathfrak{g}_C(\mathfrak{g}_E(D))$. However, the hyperplanes crossing either of these are precisely the hyperplanes crossing all of C, D, E. Thus, they cross F and D, and thus cross $\mathfrak{g}_F(E)$. □

Definition 1.8 (Orthogonal complement)**.** Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a convex subcomplex. Let P_A be the convex hull of the union of all parallel copies of A, so that $P_A \cong A \times A^{\perp}$, where $A^{\perp}$ is a CAT(0) cube complex that we call the *abstract orthogonal complement of A in $\mathcal{X}$*. For any $a \in A^{(0)}$, the convex subcomplex $\{a\} \times A^{\perp}$ is the *orthogonal complement of A at a*. See Figures 3 and 4.



FIGURE 3. Combinatorial hyperplanes are orthogonal complements of 1–cubes.



FIGURE 4. Orthogonal complements of 1–cubes e_1, e_2 and 2–cube s are shown. Note that $(e_1 \cup e_2 \cup s)^\perp \parallel \mathfrak{g}_{e_2^\perp}(\mathfrak{g}_{e_1^\perp}(s^\perp))$; this illustrates Theorem 3.5 below.

Lemma 1.9. *Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a convex subcomplex. For any $a \in A$, a hyperplane H intersects $\{a\} \times A^\perp$ if and only if H is disjoint from every parallel copy of A but intersects each hyperplane V with $V \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Hence $\{a\} \times A^\perp, \{b\} \times A^\perp$ are parallel for all $a, b \in A^{(0)}$.*

Proof. This follows from the definition of P_A: the hyperplanes crossing P_A are partitioned into two classes, those intersecting A (and its parallel copies) and those disjoint from A (and any of its parallel copies). By definition, $A^\perp$ is the convex hull of the set of 0–cubes of P_A that are separated from a only by hyperplanes of the latter type. The product structure ensures that any hyperplane of the first type crosses every hyperplane of the second type. □

1.2. **Hyperclosure and factor systems.**

Definition 1.10 (Factor system, hyperclosure)**.** The *hyperclosure* of $\mathcal{X}$ is the intersection $\mathfrak{F}$ of all sets $\mathfrak{F}'$ of convex subcomplexes of $\mathcal{X}$ that satisfy the following three properties:

(1) $\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{F}'$, and for all combinatorial hyperplanes H of $\mathcal{X}$, we have $H \in \mathfrak{F}'$;
(2) if $F, F' \in \mathfrak{F}'$, then $\mathfrak{g}_F(F') \in \mathfrak{F}'$;
(3) if $F \in \mathfrak{F}'$ and F' is parallel to F, then $F' \in \mathfrak{F}'$.

Note that $\mathfrak{F}$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$–invariant. If there exists ξ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there are at most ξ elements $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ with $x \in F$, then, following [BHS14], we call $\mathfrak{F}$ a *factor system* for $\mathcal{X}$.

Remark 1.11. The definition of a factor system in [BHS14] is more general than the definition given above. The assertion that $\mathcal{X}$ has a factor system in the sense of [BHS14] is equivalent to the assertion that the hyperclosure of $\mathcal{X}$ has finite multiplicity, because any factor system (in the sense of [BHS14]) contains all elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ whose diameter exceed a given fixed threshold.

2. ANALYSIS OF THE HYPERCLOSURE

Fix a proper $\mathcal{X}$ with a group G acting properly and cocompactly. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the hyperclosure.

2.1. **Decomposition.**

Let $\mathfrak{F}_0 = \{\mathcal{X}\}$ and, for each $n \geq 1$, let $\mathfrak{F}_n$ be the subset of $\mathfrak{F}$ consisting of those subcomplexes that can be written in the form $\mathfrak{g}_H(F)$, where $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and H is a combinatorial hyperplane. Hence $\mathfrak{F}_1$ is the set of combinatorial hyperplanes in $\mathcal{X}$

Lemma 2.1 (Decomposing $\mathfrak{F}$)**.** *Each $F \in \mathfrak{F} - \{\mathcal{X}\}$ is parallel to a subcomplex of the form*

$$\mathfrak{g}_{H_1}(\mathfrak{g}_{H_2}(\cdots \mathfrak{g}_{H_{n-1}}(H_n)\cdots))$$

for some $n \geq 1$, where each H_i is a combinatorial hyperplane, i.e. $\mathfrak{F}/_{\parallel} = (\cup_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{F}_n)/_{\parallel}$.

Proof. This follows by induction, Lemma 1.7, and the definition of $\mathfrak{F}$. □

Corollary 2.2. $\mathfrak{F} = \cup_{n\geq 0}\mathfrak{F}_n$.

Proof. It suffices to show $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \cup_{n\geq 0}\mathfrak{F}_n$. Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}$. If $F = \mathcal{X}$, then $F \in \mathfrak{F}_0$. Otherwise, by Lemma 2.1, there exists $n \geq 1$, a combinatorial hyperplane H, and a convex subcomplex $F' \in \cup_{k\leq n}\mathfrak{F}_k$ with $F \parallel \mathfrak{g}_H(F')$. Consider $P_F \cong F \times F^{\perp}$ and choose $f \in F^{\perp}$ so that $F \times \{f\}$ coincides with F. Then $F \times \{f\}$ lies in some combinatorial hyperplane H' – either $H' = H$ and $F = \mathfrak{g}_H(F)$, or F is non-unique in its parallelism class, so lies in a combinatorial hyperplane in the carrier of a hyperplane crossing $F^{\perp}$. Consider $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(\mathfrak{g}_H(F'))$. On one hand, $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(\mathfrak{g}_H(F')) \in \cup_{k\leq n+1}\mathfrak{F}_k$. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(\mathfrak{g}_H(F')) = F$. Hence $F \in \cup_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{F}_n$, as required. □

2.2. **Stabilizers act cocompactly.** The goal of this subsection is to prove that $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on F for each $F \in \mathfrak{F}$. The following lemma is standard but we include a proof in the interest of a self-contained exposition.

Lemma 2.3 (Coboundedness from finite multiplicity)**.** *Let X be a metric space and let $G \to \mathrm{Isom}(X)$ act cocompactly, and let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a G–invariant collection of subspaces such that every ball intersects finitely many elements of $\mathcal{Y}$. Then $\mathrm{Stab}_G(P)$ acts coboundedly on P for every $P \in \mathcal{Y}$.*

Proof. Let $P \in \mathcal{Y}$, choose a basepoint $r \in X$, and use cocompactness to choose $t < \infty$ so that $\mathsf{d}(x, G\cdot r) \leq t$ for all $x \in X$. Choose $g_1, \ldots, g_s \in G$ so that the G–translates of P intersecting $\mathcal{N}_{10t}(r)$ are exactly g_iP for $i \leq s$. Since $\mathcal{Y}$ is G–invariant and locally finite, $s < \infty$. Let $K_r = \max_{i\leq s}\mathsf{d}(r, g_ir)$. For each $g \in G$, the translates of P that lie within distance $10t$ of $g\cdot r$ are precisely $gg_1P, \ldots, gg_sP$ and $K_{gr} = K_r$ since $\mathsf{d}(r, g_i\cdot r) = \mathsf{d}(g\cdot r, gg_i\cdot r)$.

Fix a basepoint $p \in P$ and let $q \in P$ be an arbitrary point; choose $h_p, h_q \in G$ so that $\mathsf{d}(h_p\cdot r, p) \leq t, \mathsf{d}(h_q\cdot r, q) \leq t$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $h_q = 1$. Then $\{h_pg_iP\}_{i=1}^s$ is the set of P–translates intersecting $\mathcal{N}_{10t}(h_p\cdot r)$. Now, $p \in P$ and $\mathsf{d}(h_p\cdot r, p) < 10t$, so there exists i so that $h_pg_iP = P$, i.e. $h_pg_i \in \mathrm{Stab}_G(P)$. Finally,

$$\mathsf{d}(h_pg_i\cdot q, p) \leq \mathsf{d}(h_pg_i\cdot r, h_pg_i\cdot q) + \mathsf{d}(h_p\cdot r, p) + \mathsf{d}(h_pg_i\cdot r, h_p\cdot r) \leq 2t + K_r,$$

which is uniformly bounded. Hence the action of $\mathrm{Stab}_G(P)$ on P is cobounded. □

Remark 2.4. We use Lemma 2.3 when X and P are proper, to get a cocompact action.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex with a group G acting cocompactly. Let $Y, Y' \subset \mathcal{X}$ be parallel convex subcomplexes, then $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y)$ and $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y')$ are commensurable. Thus, if $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y)$ acts cocompactly on Y, then $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y)\cap\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y')$ acts cocompactly on Y'.*

Proof. Let T be the set of $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y)$–translates of Y'. Then each $gY' \in T$ is parallel to Y, and $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(gY', Y) = \mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y', Y)$. Since $Y^{\perp}$ is locally finite, $|T| < \infty$. Hence $K = \ker(\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y) \to \mathrm{Sym}(T))$ has finite index in $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y)$ but lies in $\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y)\cap\mathrm{Stab}_G(Y')$. By Lemma 1.6, K acts cocompactly on $Hull(Y \cup Y')$, stabilizing Y', and thus acts cocompactly on Y'. □

Definition 2.6. Let $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$. For $n \geq 1, k \geq 0$, let $\mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$ be the set of $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ so that $F = \mathfrak{g}_H(F')$ for some $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ with $\mathsf{d}(H, F') \leq k$. Let $\mathfrak{F}_{n,H} = \cup_{k\geq 0}\mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{n,k} = \cup_{H\in\mathfrak{F}_1}\mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$.

Proposition 2.7 (Cocompactness)**.** *Let $n \geq 1$. Then, for any $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$, $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on F. Hence $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on F for each $F \in \mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. The second assertion follows from the first and Corollary 2.2. We argue by double induction on n, k to prove the first assertion, with k as in Definition 2.6. First, observe that $\mathfrak{F}_n$, $\mathfrak{F}_{n,k}$ are G–invariant for all n, k. Similarly, $\mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$ is $\mathrm{Stab}_G(H)$–invariant for all $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$.

Base Case: $n = 1$**.** From local finiteness of $\mathcal{X}$, cocompactness of the action of G and Lemma 2.3, we see that $\mathrm{Stab}_G(H)$ acts cocompactly on H for each $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$.

Inductive Step 1: (n, k) **for all** k **implies** $(n + 1, 0)$**.** Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n+1,0}$. Then $F = H \cap F'$, where $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$ and $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_n$. By definition, $F' = \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F'')$ for some $F'' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and $H' \in \mathfrak{F}_1$. Thus $K = \mathrm{Stab}_G(F')$ acts cocompactly on F' by induction.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{k(H \cap F') : k \in K\}$, which is a K–invariant set of convex subcomplexes of F'. Moreover, since the set of all K–translates of H is a locally finite collection, because $\mathcal{X}$ is locally finite and H is a combinatorial hyperplane, $\mathcal{S}$ has the property that every ball in F' intersects finitely many elements of $\mathcal{S}$. Lemma 2.3, applied to the cocompact action of K on F', shows that $\mathrm{Stab}_K(H \cap F')$ (which equals $\mathrm{Stab}_K(F)$), and hence $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$, acts cocompactly on F.

Inductive Step 2: (n, k) **implies** $(n, k + 1)$**.** Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n,k+1}$ so that $F = \mathfrak{g}_H(F')$ with $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$, $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and $d = \mathsf{d}(H, F') \leq k + 1$. If $d \leq k$, induction applies. Thus, we can assume that $d = k + 1$. Then there is a product region $F \times [0, d] \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $F \times \{0\} = F$, and $F \times \{d\} \subset F'$. Then $F_1 := F \times \{1\}$ is a parallel copy of F, and $F_1 \subset \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$ with $d(H', F') = d - 1 \leq k$. By induction $L = \mathrm{Stab}_G(\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F'))$ acts cocompactly on $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$.

We claim that $F_1 = \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F') \cap \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(H)$. To see this, note that the hyperplanes that cross F_1 are exactly the hyperplanes that cross F' and H. However, those are the hyperplanes which cross H' and F' which also cross H. It easily follows that the two subcomplexes are equal.

Now let $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of L–translates of $F_1 = \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F') \cap \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(H)$ in $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$. This is an L–invariant collection of convex subcomplexes of $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$. Moreover, each ball in $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$ intersects finitely many elements of $\mathcal{T}$. Indeed, $\mathcal{T}$ is a collection of subcomplexes of the form $T_\ell = \mathfrak{g}_{\ell H'}(\ell H) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$, where $\ell \in L$. Recall that $\mathsf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(H, H') = 1$. Hence, fixing $y \in \mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$ and $t \geq 0$, if $\{T_{\ell_i}\}_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a collection of elements of $\mathcal{T}$, all of which intersect $\mathcal{N}_t(y)$, then $\{\ell_i H, \ell_i H'\}_{i \in I}$ all intersect $\mathcal{N}_{t+1}(y)$. However, by local finiteness of $\mathcal{X}$ there are only finitely many distinct $\ell_i H, \ell_i H'$. Further, if $\ell_i H = \ell_j H$ and $\ell_i H' = \ell_j H'$, then $T_{\ell_i} = T_{\ell_j}$. Thus, the index set I must be finite. Hence, by Lemma 2.3 and cocompactness of the action of L on $\mathfrak{g}_{H'}(F')$, we see (as in Inductive Step 1) that $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F_1)$ acts cocompactly on F_1. Now, since F_1 is parallel to F, we see by Lemma 2.5 that $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on F. □

2.3. **Ascending chain condition.** We reduce Theorem B to a claim about $\subsetneq$–chains in $\mathfrak{F}$.

Lemma 2.8 (Finding ascending chains)**.** *Let $\mathfrak{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ be an infinite subset satisfying $\bigcap_{U \in \mathfrak{U}} U \ni x$ for some $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ so that $x \in F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1}$ for all i.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{F}_x \supseteq \mathfrak{U}$ be the set of $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ with $x \in F$. Let Ω be the directed graph with vertex set $\mathfrak{F}_x$, with (F, F') a directed edge if $F \subsetneq F'$ and there does not exist $F'' \in \mathfrak{F}_x$ with $F \subsetneq F'' \subsetneq F'$.

We may assume that there is a unique $F_0 \in \mathfrak{F}_x$ with no incoming Ω–edges. Indeed, if F_0, F_0' have this property, then their intersection lies in $\mathfrak{F}_x$. Hence either there is a finite, directed path from $F_0 \cap F_0'$ to F_0, contradicting minimality of F_0, or there is an infinite chain in $\mathfrak{F}_x$ consisting of elements that all contain $F_0 \cap F_0'$ and are all contained in F_0; in the latter case, we are done. Similarly, we can assume that every $F \in \mathfrak{F}_x$ is at finite distance in Ω from F_0.

Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_x$ and suppose that $\{F_i\}_i$ is the set of vertices of Ω so that (F, F_i) is an edge. For $i \neq j$, we have $F \subseteq F_i \cap F_j \subsetneq F_i$, so since $F_i \cap F_j = \mathfrak{g}_{F_i}(F_j) \in \mathfrak{F}$, we have $F_i \cap F_j = F$.

The set $\{F_i\}_i$ is invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$. Also, by Proposition 2.7, $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on F. A 0–cube $y \in F$ is *diplomatic* if there exists i so that y is joined to a vertex of $F_i - F$ by a 1–cube in F_i; see Figure 5. Only uniformly finitely many F_i can witness the diplomacy of y since $\mathcal{X}$ is uniformly locally finite and $F_i \cap F_j = F$ whenever $i \neq j$. Also, y is diplomatic, witnessed by $F_{i_1}, \ldots, F_{i_k}$, if and only if gy is diplomatic, witnessed by $gF_{i_1}, \ldots, gF_{i_k}$, for each $g \in \mathrm{Stab}_G(F)$. Since $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F) \curvearrowright F$ cocompactly, we thus get $|\{F_i\}_i / \mathrm{Stab}_G(F)| < \infty$.



FIGURE 5. The 0–cube y is diplomatic: incident (bold) 1–cubes "reach out" into F_i, F_j.

Let $\widehat{\Omega}$ be the graph with a vertex for each $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ containing a point of $G \cdot x$ and a directed edge for minimal containment as above. Then $\widehat{\Omega}$ is a graded directed graph as above. For each $n \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{S}_n$ be the set of vertices in $\widehat{\Omega}$ at distance n from a minimal element. The above argument shows that G acts cofinitely on each $\mathcal{S}_n$, and thus $\widehat{\Omega}/G$ is locally finite. Hence, by König's infinity lemma, either $\widehat{\Omega}/G$ contains a directed ray or $\widehat{\Omega}^{(0)}/G$ is finite. In the former case, Ω must contain a directed ray, in which case there exists $\{F_i\} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ with $F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1}$ for all i. Up to translating by an appropriate element of G, we can assume that $x \in F_1$. The latter case means that the set of $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $F \cap G \cdot x \neq \emptyset$ is G–finite. But since G acts properly and cocompactly on $\mathcal{X}$, any G–invariant G–finite collection of subcomplexes whose stabilizers act cocompactly has finite multiplicity, a contradiction. □

Lemma 2.8 shows that Theorem B holds if all ascending chains in $\mathfrak{F}$ are finite.

3. Orthogonal complements

In this section, we first prove three general lemmas about orthogonal complements of convex subcomplexes of a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be convex subcomplexes and let $a \in A$. Then $\{a\} \times B^\perp \subseteq \{a\} \times A^\perp$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \{a\} \times B^\perp$. Then every hyperplane H separating x from a separates two parallel copies of B and thus separates two parallel copies of A, since $A \subseteq B$. It follows from Lemma 1.9 that every hyperplane separating a from x crosses $\{a\} \times A^\perp$, whence $x \in \{a\} \times A^\perp$. □

Given a convex subcomplex $F \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, fix a base 0–cube $f \in F$ and for brevity, let $F^\perp = \{f\} \times F^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. Note that $f \in F^\perp$, and so we let $F^{\perp\perp} = \{f\} \times \left(\{f\} \times F^\perp\right)^\perp$, which again contains f, and so we can similarly define $\left(\left(F^\perp\right)^\perp\right)^\perp$ etc. In many other contexts, the orthogonal complementation operation is an involution, but this is not true in cube complexes. However:

Lemma 3.2. *Let F be a convex subcomplex of $\mathcal{X}$. Then $\left(\left(F^\perp\right)^\perp\right)^\perp = F^\perp$.*

Proof. If F is a convex subcomplex, there is a parallel copy of $F^\perp$ based at each 0–cube of F, since $F \times F^\perp$ is a convex subcomplex of $\mathcal{X}$. Thus $F \hookrightarrow_\parallel \left(F^\perp\right)^\perp$, and by Lemma 3.1 we have $F^\perp \supseteq \left(\left(F^\perp\right)^\perp\right)^\perp$. To obtain the other inclusion, we show that every parallel copy of F is contained in a parallel copy of $\left(F^\perp\right)^\perp$. This is clear since, letting $A = F^\perp$, we have that $A^\perp \times A$ is a convex subcomplex of $\mathcal{X}$, but $F \subset A^\perp$ by the above, and thus $F \times F^\perp \subseteq \left(F^\perp\right)^\perp \times F^\perp$, both of which are convex subcomplexes of $\mathcal{X}$. Hence $F^\perp \subseteq \left(\left(F^\perp\right)^\perp\right)^\perp$, completing the proof. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\{A_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a set of convex subcomplexes of $\mathcal{X}$ with $\operatorname{diam}(A_i) > 0$ for all i and choose $a_i \in A_i$. Then for any $a \in Hull\left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} A_i\right)$, we have that $\{a\} \times Hull\left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} A_i\right)^\perp$ is the largest subcomplex parallel into $\{a_i\} \times {A_i}^\perp$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.*

Further, if $a \in \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i \neq \emptyset$, *then* $\{a\} \times Hull\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i\right)^\perp = \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left(\{a\} \times {A_i}^\perp\right)$.

Proof. To prove the first assertion, we must show that the hyperplanes crossing $Hull\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i\right)^\perp$ are precisely the hyperplanes crossing each ${A_i}^\perp$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

If V is a hyperplane which crosses $Hull\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i\right)$, then V has one of two types. Either:

(1) V crosses A_i for some i;
(2) V separates A_i from A_j for $i, j \in I$;

If H is a hyperplane which crosses all such V, then for all i and any $a_i \in A_i$, H crosses $\{a_i\} \times {A_i}^\perp$, since it crosses every hyperplane which crosses each A_i. Now, suppose H crosses every hyperplane crossing each A_i and let V be a hyperplane which separates A_j and A_k. Then V must separate every hyperplane crossing A_j from every hyperplane crossing A_k. Thus, H must cross V. Thus, the set of hyperplanes crossing every hyperplane crossing $Hull\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} A_i\right)$ is exactly the intersection of the hyperplanes which cross each $\{a_i\} \times {A_i}^\perp$, completing the proof.

The second statement follows immediately from the above discussion and Definition 1.5. □

3.1. **Alternative characterization of $\mathfrak{F}$.** For convex subcomplexes D, F of $\mathcal{X}$, we write $F = D^\perp$ to mean $F = \{f\} \times D^\perp$ for some $f \in F$. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the hyperclosure in $\mathcal{X}$, and assume for the rest of the section that $\mathcal{X}$ is uniformly locally finite, i.e. there exists $B < \infty$ so that each 0–cube x of $\mathcal{X}$ lies in $\leq B$ combinatorial hyperplanes.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an infinite set of hyperplanes in the uniformly locally finite CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$. Suppose that, if $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ and V is some hyperplane separating H, H', then $V \in \mathcal{H}$. Then there exists a sequence $(H_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of hyperplanes in $\mathcal{H}$ such that H_n separates H_{n-1} from H_{n+1} for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. For each $n \geq 1$, choose a finite subset $\mathcal{H}_n$ of $\mathcal{H}$ so that:

- $\mathcal{H}_1$ consists of a single hyperplane H_1;
- $\mathcal{H}_n \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ for each $n \geq 1$;
- if $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}_n$ and V is some hyperplane separating H, H', then $V \in \mathcal{H}_n$.

Choose a 0–cube $x_0 \in \mathcal{N}(H_1)$. For each $n \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{X}'_n$ be the set of all $x_n \in \mathcal{X}^{(0)}$ so that every hyperplane separating x_n from x_0 belongs to $\mathcal{H}_n$. Since $\mathcal{H}_n$ is closed under separation, $\mathcal{X}'_n \neq \emptyset$ and moreover, for each $H \in \mathcal{H}_n$, there exists $y \in \mathcal{X}'_n$ so that H separates y from x_0. Let $\mathcal{X}_n$ be the convex hull of $\mathcal{X}'_n \cup \{x_0\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{X}_n \subsetneq \mathcal{X}_{n+1}$ for all n. Moreover, since there is a uniform bound on the degree of each 0–cube in $\mathcal{X}$, and hence in each $\mathcal{X}_n$, and the number of hyperplanes crossing $\mathcal{X}_n$ tends to infinity as $n \to \infty$, we see that $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{X}_n) \xrightarrow{n} \infty$. König's lemma provides an infinite geodesic ray in $\mathcal{X}$, all of whose hyperplanes belong to $\cup_n \mathcal{H}_n \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. The finite dimension of $\mathcal{X}$ and Ramsey's theorem allow one to choose the desired $(H_n)_{n\geq 1}$ from among the hyperplanes crossing this ray. □

Theorem 3.5 (Alternative characterization of $\mathfrak{F}$)**.** *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be uniformly locally finite and let $F \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a convex subcomplex. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) there exists a convex subcomplex A so that $F = A^\perp$;
(2) there exists a ***compact*** *convex subcomplex C so that $F = C^\perp$;*
(3) $F \in \{\mathcal{X}\} \cup \bigcup_n \mathfrak{F}_n$.

Example 3.6 (Degenerate cases of Theorem 3.5)**.** If $A = \mathcal{X}$, then $F = A^\perp$ is a 0–cube, which, being an intersection of combinatorial hyperplanes, lies in $\cup_n \mathfrak{F}_n$. But the 0–cube F is also easily seen to be the orthogonal complement of any maximal cube C containing it. On the other hand, if $A = C$ is a 0–cube, then $F = A^\perp = \mathcal{X}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Clearly (2) implies (1). We now prove that (3) implies (2). Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ for $n \geq 1$. If $n = 1$ and F is a combinatorial hyperplane, $F = e^\perp$ for some 1–cube e of $\mathcal{X}$.

Next, assume that $n \geq 2$ and write $F = \mathfrak{g}_H(F')$ where $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and H is a combinatorial hyperplane. Induction on n gives $F' = (C')^\perp$ for some compact convex subcomplex C'.

Let e be a 1–cube with orthogonal complement $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$, chosen as close as possible to C', so that $\mathsf{d}(e, C') = \mathsf{d}(H, C')$. Let C be the convex hull of (the possibly disconnected set) $e \cup C'$. By Lemma 3.3 if we fix $x = H \cap e$, $\{x\} \times C^\perp$ is the largest convex subcomplex of $\mathcal{X}$ parallel into H and F' containing x. However, that is exactly $\mathfrak{g}_H(F')$. Moreover, since only finitely many hyperplanes V appear on the above list, C is compact.

We now prove (1) $\implies$ (3). Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a convex subcomplex. If $A^\perp$ consists of a single point then there is nothing to prove, since each 0–cube is a finite intersection of combinatorial hyperplanes and thus lies in $\cup_n \mathfrak{F}_n$. If $A^\perp = \mathcal{X}$, then we are done by hypothesis.

Hence suppose that A is not unique in its parallelism class and $\operatorname{diam}(A) > 0$ (otherwise, $A^\perp = \mathcal{X}$). Let $P \cong A \times A^\perp$ be the convex hull in $\mathcal{X}$ of the union of all parallel copies of A, fix $x \in A^{(0)}$. Let $H_1, \dots, H_k$ be all of the hyperplanes intersecting A whose carriers contain x, so that for each i, there is a combinatorial hyperplanes H_i^+ associated to H_i with $x \in H_i^+$. Let $Y = \cap_{i=1}^k H_i^+$, which is a convex subcomplex such that $Y \cap A = \{x\}$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all combinatorial hyperplanes associated to hyperplanes crossing A. Let $H' \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $\mathfrak{g}_Y(H' \cap A) \subseteq Y \cap A = \{x\}$, we see that $x \in \mathfrak{g}_Y(H')$. We claim that

$$A^\perp = \bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H'),$$

where $A^\perp$ denotes the orthogonal complement of A at x.

To prove this, suppose that $y \in A^\perp$. Then every hyperplane V separating y from x crosses each of the hyperplanes H' crossing A, and thus crosses Y, whence $y \in \mathfrak{g}_Y(H')$ for each $H' \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus $A^\perp \subseteq \bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H')$. On the other hand, suppose that $y \in \bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H')$. Then every hyperplane H' separating x from y crosses every hyperplane crossing A, so $y \in A^\perp$.

Second, the preceding assertion shows that it is sufficient to product a finite collection $\mathfrak{H}$ of hyperplanes H' crossing A so that

$$\bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H') = \bigcap_{H' \in \mathfrak{H}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H').$$

Indeed, if there is such a collection, then we have shown $A^\perp$ to be the intersection of finitely many elements of $\mathfrak{F}_k$, whence $A^\perp \in \mathfrak{F}_{k+|\mathfrak{H}|}$, as required. Hence suppose for a contradiction that for any finite collection $\mathfrak{H} \subset \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H') \subsetneq \bigcap_{H' \in \mathfrak{H}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H').$$

For each m, let $\mathcal{H}_m$ be the (finite) set of hyperplanes H' intersecting $A \cap \mathcal{N}_m(x)$ (and hence satisfying $x \in \mathfrak{g}_Y(H')$). Observe that $\mathcal{H}_m$ is *closed under separation* in the sense that if V is a hyperplane separating two elements of $\mathcal{H}_m$, then $V \in \mathcal{H}_m$.

Consider the collection $\mathcal{B}_m$ of all hyperplanes W such that W crosses each element of $\mathcal{H}_m$ and W crosses Y, but W fails to cross $A^\perp$. (This means that there exists $j > m$ and some $U \in \mathcal{H}_j$ so that $W \cap U = \emptyset$.)

Note that either $\bigcup_{m \geq 1} \mathcal{B}_m$ is finite, or it satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.4. In the former case, there exists m so that we can take $\mathcal{H}_m$ to be our desired set $\mathfrak{H}$, and we are done. Hence suppose we are in the latter case, so that Lemma 3.4 produces a sequence $(W_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of hyperplanes in $\cup_m \mathcal{B}_m$ so that W_n separates $W_{n \pm 1}$ for $n \geq 1$.

For each n, there is a hyperplane $H_n \in \bigcup_{m \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_m$ so that W_n separates H_n from W_1. Indeed, choose H_n so that W_n fails to cross H_n. Since H_n crosses some ball about x in A, for each sufficiently large k, we have that W_k crosses H_n. Now, if $k > n$, since W_n separates W_k, W_1, and W_n does not cross H_n, and W_k crosses H_n, we must have that W_n separates H_n, W_1. Note

that $\mathfrak{g}_Y(H_n) \subseteq \overrightarrow{W_n} \cap Y$, where $\overrightarrow{W_n}$ is the halfspace associated to W_n that contains H_n. Thus $x \in \bigcap_n \mathfrak{g}_Y(H_n) \subseteq \bigcap_n \overrightarrow{W_n}$, which is an infinite decreasing sequence of halfspaces, which is thus empty. This is a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.7. *Let A be a convex subcomplex of $\mathcal{X}$. There exists a compact convex subcomplex $C \subseteq A$ so that $C^\perp = A^\perp$.*

Proof. Given a convex subcomplex A, Theorem 3.5 guarantees that $A^\perp \in \mathfrak{F}$, and is, in fact, the intersection of the projections of a finite collection $\mathfrak{H}$ of hyperplanes crossing A onto a specified hyperplane H, crossing A. However, this implies that $A^\perp$ is precisely the orthogonal complement of the convex hull of a finite set of edges, each of which can be chosen in A, dual to a hyperplane in $\mathfrak{H}$. Let C be this convex hull. Then C is convex, compact, and $C \subseteq A$, as desired. □

4. Proof of the main theorem

We are now ready to prove our main result. Actually, our proof shows that in any uniformly locally finite CAT(0) cube complex, the hyperclosure does not contain an infinite ascending chain that does not stabilize.

Proof of Theorem B. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex with a proper, cocompact action by a group G. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be the hyperclosure; our goal is to prove that there exists $N < \infty$ so that each 0–cube of $\mathcal{X}$ is contained in at most N elements of $\mathfrak{F}$. Recall from Corollary 2.2 that $\mathfrak{F} = \cup_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{F}_n$, where the $\mathfrak{F}_n$ are defined inductively as in Section 2.1.

Lemma 2.8 shows that either the multiplicity of $\mathfrak{F}$ is finite, or there exists a 0–cube $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and a sequence $(F_i)_{i\geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ so that $x \in F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1}$ for each $i \geq 1$. For the sake of brevity, given any subcomplex $E \ni x$, let $E^\perp$ denote the orthogonal complement of E *based at* x. Now, Corollary 3.7 provides, for each $i \geq 1$, a compact, convex subcomplex C_i, containing x and contained in F_i, so that $C_i^\perp = F_i^\perp$.

Let $C_1' = C_1$ and, for each $i \geq 2$, let $C_i' = Hull(C_{i-1}' \cup C_i)$. Then C_i' is convex, by definition, and compact, being the convex hull of the union of a pair of compact subspaces. Now, $C_i' \subseteq F_i$ for each i. Indeed, $C_1' = C_1 \subseteq F_1$ by construction. Now, by induction, $C_{i-1}' \subset F_{i-1}$, so $C_{i-1}' \subset F_i$ since $F_{i-1} \subset F_i$. But $C_i \subset F_i$ by construction, so $C_i \cup C_{i-1}' \subset F_i$, whence the hull of that union, namely C_i', lies in F_i since F_i is convex. Hence $C_i \subseteq C_i' \subseteq F_i$ for $i \geq 1$.

By Lemma 3.1, we have for each i that $F_i^\perp \subseteq (C_i')^\perp \subseteq C_i^\perp = F_i^\perp$ since $C_i \subseteq C_i'$. Hence $(C_i')_{i\geq 1}$ is an ascending sequence of convex, compact subcomplexes, all containing x, with $(C_i')^\perp = F_i^\perp$ for all i. By Lemma 3.1, $((C_i')^\perp)_{i\geq 1} = (F_i^\perp)_{i\geq 1}$ is a descending chain. Further, we must have that ${F_i}^\perp \neq {F_{i+1}}^\perp$ for all i. To see this, recall from Theorem 3.5 that there exists a convex subcomplex A_i, which can be chosen to contain x so that ${A_i}^\perp = F_i$. Thus, if ${F_i}^\perp = {F_{i+1}}^\perp$, then

$$\left({F_i}^\perp\right)^\perp = \left({F_{i+1}}^\perp\right)^\perp.$$

Using Lemma 3.2 this means that $F_i = F_{i+1}$. Thus, the sequence $({F_i}^\perp)_{i\geq 1}$ is *strictly* decreasing.

Let $T_\infty = \bigcap_i (C_i')^\perp$. By Lemma 3.3, $T_\infty = \left(\bigcup_{i\geq 1} C_i'\right)^\perp$. It follows from Corollary 3.7 that there is a compact convex subcomplex D_∞ so that $T_\infty = D_\infty^\perp$ and $D_\infty \subset \bigcup_{i\geq 1} C_i'$. However, since D_∞ is compact, $D_\infty \subsetneq C_R'$ for some $R \geq 1$. Hence $T_\infty \subsetneq (C_R')^\perp \subsetneq D_\infty^\perp = T_\infty$, a contradiction, completing the proof. □

5. Factor systems and the simplicial boundary

Corollary C follows from Theorem B, Proposition 5.1 and [Hag13, Lemma 3.32]. Proposition 5.1 is implicit in the proof of [DHS16, Theorem 10.1]; we give a streamlined proof here.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a CAT(0) cube complex with a factor system $\mathfrak{S}$. Then each simplex σ of $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$ is* visible*, i.e. there exists a combinatorial geodesic ray α such that the set of hyperplanes intersecting α is a boundary set representing the simplex σ.*

Proof. Let σ be a simplex of $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$. Let σ' be a maximal simplex containing σ, spanned by $v_0, \dots, v_d$. The existence of σ' follows from [Hag13, Theorem 3.14]. By Theorem 3.19 of [Hag13], σ' is visible, i.e. there exists a combinatorial geodesic ray γ such that the set $\mathcal{H}(\gamma)$ of hyperplanes crossing γ is a boundary set representing σ'. We will prove that each 0–simplex v_i is visible. It will then follow from [Hag13, Theorem 3.23] that any face of σ' (hence σ) is visible.

Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be the convex hull of γ. The set of hyperplanes crossing $\mathcal{Y}$ is exactly $\mathcal{H}(\gamma)$. Since $\mathcal{Y}$ is convex in $\mathcal{X}$, Lemma 8.4 of [BHS14] implies that $\mathcal{Y}$ contains a factor system.

By Theorem 3.10 of [Hag13], we can write $\mathcal{H}(\gamma) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{d} \mathcal{V}_i$, where each $\mathcal{V}_i$ is a minimal boundary set representing the 0–simplex v_i. Moreover, up to reordering and discarding finitely many hyperplanes (i.e. moving the basepoint of γ) if necessary, whenever $i < j$, each hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{V}_j$ crosses all but finitely many of the hyperplanes in $\mathcal{V}_i$.

For each $1 \leq i \leq d$, minimality of $\mathcal{V}_i$ provides a sequence of hyperplanes $(V_n^i)_{n \geq 0}$ in $\mathcal{V}_i$ so that V_n^i separates $V_{n\pm 1}^i$ for $n \geq 1$ and so that any other $U \in \mathcal{V}_i$ separates V_m^i, V_n^i for some m, n (one may have to discard finitely many hyperplanes from $\mathcal{V}_i$ for this to hold, but this is unproblematic: it simply replaces γ with a sub-ray and shrinks $\mathcal{Y}$ correspondingly).

We will show that, after discarding finitely many hyperplanes from $\mathcal{H}(\gamma)$ if necessary, every element of $\mathcal{V}_i$ crosses every element of $\mathcal{V}_j$, whenever $i \neq j$. Since every element of $\mathcal{V}_i$ either lies in $(V_n^i)_n$ or separates two elements of that sequence, it follows that U and V cross whenever $U \in \mathcal{V}_i, V \in \mathcal{V}_j$ and $i \neq j$. Then, for any i, choose $n \geq 0$ and let $H = \bigcap_{j \neq i} V_n^j$. Projecting γ to H yields a geodesic ray in $\mathcal{Y}$, all but finitely many of whose dual hyperplanes belong to $\mathcal{V}_i$, as required. Hence it suffices to show that V_n^i and V_m^j cross for all m, n whenever $i \neq j$.

Fix $j \leq d$ and $i < j$. For each $n \geq 0$, let $m(n) \geq 0$ be minimal so that $V_{m(n)}^j$ fails to cross V_n^i. Note that we may assume that this is defined: if V_n^i crosses all V_m^j, then, since V_m^j crosses all but finitely many of the hyperplanes from $\mathcal{V}_i$, it crosses V_k^i for $k >> n$. Since it also crosses V_n^i, it must also cross V_r^i for all $n \leq r \leq k$. By discarding V_k^i for $k \leq n$ we complete the proof. Now suppose that $m(n)$ is bounded as $n \to \infty$. Then there exists N so that V_n^i, V_m^j cross whenever $m, n \geq N$, and we are done, as before.

Hence suppose that $m(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. In other words, for all $m \geq 0$, there exists $n \geq 0$ so that V_m^j crosses V_k^i if and only if $k \geq n$. Choose $M \gg 0$ and choose n maximal with $m(n) < M$. Then all of the hyperplanes $V_{m(k)}^j$ with $k \leq n$ cross $V_k^i, \dots, V_n^i$ but do not cross V_t^i for $t < k$. Hence the subcomplexes $\mathfrak{g}_{V_n^i}(V_k^i), k \leq n$ are all different: $\mathfrak{g}_{V_n^i}(V_k^i)$ intersects $V_{m(k)}^j$ but $\mathfrak{g}_{V_n^i}(V_{k-1}^i)$ does not. On the other hand, since V_k^i separates V_ℓ^i from V_n^i when $\ell < k < n$, every hyperplane crossing V_n^i and V_ℓ^i crosses V_k^i, so $\mathfrak{g}_{V_n^i}(V_k^i) \cap \mathfrak{g}_{V_n^i}(V_\ell^i) \neq \emptyset$. Thus the factor system on $\mathcal{Y}$ has multiplicity at least n. But since $m(n) \to \infty$, we could choose n arbitrarily large in the preceding argument, violating the definition of a factor system. □

Proof of Corollary D. If γ is a CAT(0) geodesic, then it can be approximated, up to Hausdorff distance depending on $\dim \mathcal{X}$, by a combinatorial geodesic, so assume that γ is a combinatorial geodesic ray. By Corollary C, the simplex of $\partial_\triangle \mathcal{X}$ represented by γ is spanned by 0–simplices $v_0, \dots, v_d$ with each v_i represented by a combinatorial geodesic ray γ_i. The proof of [Hag13, Theorem 3.23] shows that, up to truncating a finite segment from γ, we have $\mathcal{Y} \cong \prod_i \mathcal{Y}_i$, where $\mathcal{Y}_i = Hull(\gamma_i)$. The projection of γ to each γ_i is a geodesic representing v_i. The product of these geodesics is a combinatorially isometrically embedded (possibly non-convex) $(d+1)$-dimensional orthant subcomplex of $\mathcal{Y}$ containing (the truncated) γ. □

References

[BH99] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. MR 1744486 (2000k:53038)

[BH16] Jason Behrstock and Mark F Hagen, *Cubulated groups: thickness, relative hyperbolicity, and simplicial boundaries*, Groups Geom. Dyn. **10** (2016), no. 2, 649–707. MR 3513112

[BHS14] Jason Behrstock, Mark F Hagen, and Alessandro Sisto, *Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces I: curve complexes for cubical groups*, arXiv:1412.2171 (2014).

[BHS15] ———, *Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces II: combination theorems and the distance formula*, arXiv:1509.00632 (2015).

[BKS08] Mladen Bestvina, Bruce Kleiner, and Michah Sageev, *Quasiflats in CAT(0) complexes*, arXiv preprint arXiv:0804.2619 (2008).

[BW12] Nicolas Bergeron and Daniel T. Wise, *A boundary criterion for cubulation*, Amer. J. Math. **134** (2012), no. 3, 843–859. MR 2931226

[Che00] Victor Chepoi, *Graphs of some CAT(0) complexes*, Advances in Applied Mathematics **24** (2000), no. 2, 125–179.

[CS11] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace and Michah Sageev, *Rank rigidity for CAT(0) cube complexes*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 4, 851–891. MR 2827012

[DHS16] Matthew G Durham, Mark F Hagen, and Alessandro Sisto, *Boundaries and automorphisms of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.01061 (2016).

[Hag07] Frédéric Haglund, *Isometries of CAT(0) cube complexes are semi-simple*, arXiv preprint arXiv:0705.3386 (2007).

[Hag13] Mark F Hagen, *The simplicial boundary of a CAT(0) cube complex*, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **13** (2013), no. 3, 1299–1367.

[Hag14] ———, *Weak hyperbolicity of cube complexes and quasi-arboreal groups*, J. Topol. **7** (2014), no. 2, 385–418. MR 3217625

[Hua14] Jingyin Huang, *Top dimensional quasiflats in CAT(0) cube complexes*, arXiv:1410.8195 (2014).

[HW15] Mark F. Hagen and Daniel T. Wise, *Cubulating hyperbolic free-by-cyclic groups: the general case*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **25** (2015), no. 1, 134–179. MR 3320891

[MM99] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity*, Invent. Math. **138** (1999), no. 1, 103–149. MR 1714338 (2000i:57027)

[MM00] H. A. Masur and Y. N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **10** (2000), no. 4, 902–974. MR 1791145

[NR97] Graham Niblo and Lawrence Reeves, *Groups acting on* CAT(0) *cube complexes*, Geom. Topol. **1** (1997), approx. 7 pp. (electronic). MR 1432323

[NR98] G. A. Niblo and L. D. Reeves, *The geometry of cube complexes and the complexity of their fundamental groups*, Topology **37** (1998), no. 3, 621–633. MR 1604899

[OW11] Yann Ollivier and Daniel T. Wise, *Cubulating random groups at density less than* 1/6, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 9, 4701–4733. MR 2806688

[Sag95] Michah Sageev, *Ends of group pairs and non-positively curved cube complexes*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **71** (1995), no. 3, 585–617. MR 1347406

[Sag14] ———, CAT(0) *cube complexes and groups*, Geometric group theory, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., vol. 21, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2014, pp. 7–54. MR 3329724

[SW05] Michah Sageev and Daniel T. Wise, *The Tits alternative for* CAT(0) *cubical complexes*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **37** (2005), no. 5, 706–710. MR 2164832

[Wis] Daniel T Wise, *The structure of groups with a quasiconvex hierarchy. Preprint (2011)*.

[Wis04] ———, *Cubulating small cancellation groups*, Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA **14** (2004), no. 1, 150–214.

[Xie05] Xiangdong Xie, *The Tits boundary of a CAT(0) 2-complex*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **357** (2005), no. 4, 1627–1661.

DPMMS, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
E-mail address: markfhagen@gmail.com

Mathematics Department, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA
E-mail address: tisusse@gmail.com